DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 425 127 SP 038 203

AUTHOR Earley, Penelope M.

TITLE Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants for States and Partnerships: HEA, Title II.

INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1998-10-00
NOTE 11p.
AVAILABLE FROM AACTE Publications, 1307 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 300, Washington, DC 20005-4701.
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; Grants; Higher Education; *Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *State Programs; Teacher Competencies; *Teacher Recruitment; *Teacher Shortage; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS American Association of Colleges for Teacher Educ; *Higher Education Act Title II

ABSTRACT

The Higher Education Act (HEA) was enacted during the 1960s to help needy college students attend institutions of higher learning via federal grants and loans. Since then, amendments to HEA have established and supported various college and university-focused programs. Teacher education initiatives were placed in Title V of the HEA. A coalition of education organizations suggested replacing Title V with a new three-part program, and the U.S. Department of Education advanced a two-part initiative. Eventually, the Senate and House developed and passed a final bill using components from several teacher education legislative proposals. The HEA includes a new Title II authorizing programs to recruit and prepare teachers and gather data on the U.S.'s teacher education system. Title II's purpose is to recruit teachers in areas with shortages of qualified personnel, prepare teachers in content and teaching methods, and gather data on state and college or university policies and procedures regarding teacher quality. Title II funds three related programs: partnerships, state initiatives, and teacher recruitment. This monograph explains the three programs, then discusses authorization level for the programs; data reporting by states and institutions of higher education receiving HEA funds; and preparation for Title II implementation (Title II awards, constructing a systemic framework, and data reporting). (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 425 127

Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants for States and Partnerships: HEA, Title II

AACTE Issue Paper

Penelope M. Earley

October 1998

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SL038003

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Imig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is a national, voluntary association of colleges and universities with undergraduate or graduate programs to prepare professional educators. The Association supports programs in data gathering, equity, leadership development, networking, policy analysis, professional issues, and scholarship.

AACTE Issue Papers are supported by contributions from the Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education, the Association of Colleges and School of Education in State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Universities, and the Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities.

The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this monograph do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The AACTE does not endorse or warrant this information. The AACTE is publishing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators. The authors were encouraged to express their judgement freely. The reader must evaluate this information in light of the unique circumstances of any particular situation and must determine independently the applicability of this information thereto.

Copies of School Choice and Privatization Efforts: A Legislative Survey, may be ordered from:

AACTE Publications
1307 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-4701

Copyright 1998 by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
All Rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants for States and Partnerships: HEA, Title II

by Penelope M. Earley

Introduction

The Higher Education Act (HEA) was first enacted during the 1960s as a vehicle to help needy college students attend institutions of higher learning through a system of federal grants and loans. Since the 1960s, amendments to HEA established and supported a range of other college and university-focused programs. Teacher education initiatives were placed in Title V of the Act. In recent years, Title V became the home for many very small programs that rarely were funded and that were only indirectly connected to the preparation of educators.

As the 105th Congress considered what kinds of programs it would include in the 1997-1998 Higher Education Amendments, lawmakers decided that Title V should be streamlined and that unfunded programs would no longer be kept on the books. With that clean slate approach in mind, the Congress began to develop amendments to the Higher Education Act that would result in its reauthorization for another five years. Although most congressional attention was directed to the student financial aid components found in HEA, Title IV, there was an unusual amount of interest in how the federal government might leverage changes in teacher education.

Interest in ways to revise HEA, Title V was not limited to the Congress. Many education organizations as well as the U.S. Department of Education felt that concern about teacher education as expressed by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and others dictated a new federal investment in educator recruitment and preparation. Moving on parallel but independent tracks, a coalition of education organizations, the Department of Education, and members of the Congress developed recommendations for new federal programs to enhance teaching. In addition, a number of think tanks, such as the Progressive Policy Institute and the Heritage Foundation called for Congress to address what they termed shortcomings in teacher preparation.

The higher education association coalition, formed under the aegis of the American Council on Education and led by AACTE, suggested that Title V be replaced with a new three-part program that would fund P-16 partnerships; make awards to state education agencies; and support minority teacher recruitment. The U.S. Department of Education advanced a two-part initiative that would give grants to "lighthouse" colleges or universities and would promote minority teacher recruitment. A number of Representatives and Senators introduced teacher education bills, including S. 1201 and H.R. 2698 (Frist/McCarthy) which was endorsed by the higher education coalition. However, several legislative measures created anxiety among teacher educators and higher education administrators. One such bill would have refashioned Title V into a program directed only to supporting alternative certification programs created and operated *in lieu* of education schools, colleges or departments. Another proposal, that never became a free-standing piece of legislation, would have linked an institution's eligibility for HEA, Title IV student financial aid to the pass rate of students on the state's teacher licensure examination.

Using components from the various teacher education legislative proposals, the Senate and

House education committees constructed separate bills that ultimately were passed by their respective bodies. Because the House and Senate teacher education provisions were significantly different, a final bill was developed by a conference committee and passed by both chambers in late September. On October 7 the Higher Education Act was signed into law by President Clinton. This law includes a new Title II authorizing programs to recruit and prepare teachers and to gather data on the teacher education system in the United States. A summary of provisions in the new Title II follows.

Title II: Purpose

Title II's purpose is to recruit persons to teach in areas with shortages of qualified personnel; to prepare them in both content (teaching field) and how to teach; and to gather data on state and college or university policies and procedures related to teacher quality.

Title II: Structure

Three related programs are funded through Title II: partnerships, state initiatives, and teacher recruitment. Forty-five percent of appropriated funds are to be awarded to IHE/K-12 partnerships; 45 percent of funds are to be awarded to states; and 10 percent are to be used for teacher recruitment, with only states or partnerships that qualify for other Title II awards eligible to apply for these funds. Partnerships and states will apply through a Department of Education issued Request for Proposal (RFP) and all proposals will be peer reviewed. Both states and partnerships must provide in-kind or matching funds and must keep administrative costs below two percent. Partnership grants are for five years and state grants for three. They are one-time awards.

Title II: Partnership Grants

An eligible partnership must include a partner institution of higher education (IHE), a school or unit of arts and sciences, and a high need local education agency (LEA). A governor, state education agency (SEA), state board, other IHEs, charter schools, private K-12 schools, a non-profit organization, or a business may be part of the partnership, but priority will be given to partnerships that involve businesses. No partner may receive more than 50 percent of the federal funds. There is a matching requirement of 25 percent and 35 percent for the first two grant years, and 50 percent for the last three.

A "partner institution" is described in the law as one that is approved to prepare teachers and is able to demonstrate one of the following: (1) 80 percent of students planning to teach pass subject matter licensure examinations; (2) the state considers it a high performing institution; or (3) it requires future teachers to engage in intensive clinical experiences and graduate with an academic or arts and sciences major.

Partnerships must use funds for three purposes, but may use funds for other activities as well. The three required objectives are: (1) Implementing changes within education schools, colleges, or programs to hold them accountable for preparing teachers well-versed in their teaching field and with strong teaching skills. Such revisions should be based on reliable research. (2) Providing sustained and high quality preservice clinical experience, including teacher mentoring. And, (3) creating opportunities for enhanced and ongoing professional development for teachers (this includes both subject matter and teaching skills).

Partnerships *may* use funds to: (a) prepare teachers to work with diverse student populations; (b) disseminate information on effective practices by the partnership or in the state; (c) establish leadership programs for administrators; and (d) teacher recruitment activities supported elsewhere in Title II.

Partnership grants will be evaluated on the basis of whether student achievement in partnership LEAs has increased; evidence that individu-

als are remaining in teaching careers; enhanced teaching candidate performance on the state's licensure examinations; an increased percentage of teachers prepared in the subject matter they will teach and how to teach it; and more teachers trained in technology.

Title II: State Grants

The governor or the agency responsible for teacher licensure and teacher education program approval may apply for a state grant. The application must demonstrate that the governor and appropriate state agencies have been consulted in the development of the proposal and priority will be given to states that are implementing initiatives to improve academic content and teaching skills of prospective educators or are attempting to reduce the shortage of highly qualified teachers in high-poverty urban and rural areas. There is a 50 percent match for the federal funds.

States are to use Title II funds to ensure that current and future teachers possess necessary teaching skills and content knowledge. Specifically they may: (1) support ways to hold IHEs accountable for preparing teachers who know subject matter and how to teach it; (2) change licensure requirements; (3) create alternative routes to teaching through arts and sciences colleges or through non-profit organizations; (4) establish or expand current alternative routes; (5) create performance pay incentives for teachers and establish ways to remove incompetent or unqualified teachers; (6) end social promotion; or (7) engage in teacher recruitment activities supported elsewhere in Title II.

Each year state grants will be evaluated on the basis of elevated student achievement; the extent to which standards to enter teaching have been raised; changes in licensure requirements; enhanced candidate performance on teacher licensure examinations; an increase in the percentage of secondary school classes taught by teachers with expertise in their teaching field (evidenced by an academic major or other measures); an increase in the percentage of elementary school classes taught by teachers with arts and sciences majors or who demonstrate academic competence by other measures; a reduction in teacher shortages; more professional development for teachers; or evidence that more teachers are prepared to integrate technology into classrooms.

Title II: Teacher Recruitment

States and partnerships that are eligible to receive funds through Title II may also apply for teacher recruitment grants. Applications are made to the Secretary of Education.

Teacher recruitment funds may be used for: (1) scholarships; (2) support services; (3) follow-up services during the students' first three years of teaching; and (4) working with LEAs to recruit such teachers. Scholarships are to be repaid by teaching in a high-need LEA with specifics of the teaching service requirements to be determined by the Secretary of Education.

Title II: Authorization

The law provides for an authorization level of $300,000,000 for the three programs in Title II. For fiscal year 1999, the Congress has appropriated $75,000,000 to be allocated among the three Title II programs as follows: 45 percent for state grants, 45 percent for partnerships, and 10 percent for teacher recruitment. All awards will be made through an RFP process administered by the Secretary of Education.

Title II: State and Institutional Data Reporting

All states and IHEs that directly or indirectly receive any funds through the Higher Education Act must provide the Secretary of Education with data on teacher preparation standards and procedures. This data reporting is mandatory and will be phased in over two years. Within nine

months the National Center for Education Statistics must develop key definitions and a uniform reporting method for data required in HEA, Title II. This is to be done in consultation with IHEs and states. Within 18 months IHEs must (1) Provide the state with information on pass rates of their students for each required licensure assessment. This applies only to students taking the examination within three years of completing the program. If 10 or fewer students take any one examination in a given year, the data may be averaged over three years. Moreover, the Secretary of Education is required to ensure that reporting methods for these data protect the privacy of individuals. Institutions have the additional responsibility of making their licensure examination pass rate data public and reporting how these rates compare with averages for all teacher preparation programs in the state. (2) IHEs must report the number of students in the teacher preparation program and the faculty to student ratio and average number of hours of supervised practice teaching required. (3) Institutions must indicate if they are approved or accredited by the state or if they have been designated as low performing by the state. IHEs may be fined up to $25,000 for not reporting the above data.

Within two years each state must report to the Secretary of Education a description of (1) its licensure requirements; (2) standards used for licensure; (3) extent to which K-12 standards and teacher licensure requirements are aligned; (4) the percentage of teaching candidates who passed each required teaching examination; (5) the pass rate scores disaggregated by education school, college, or program; (6) the number of licensure waivers granted each year, disaggregated by low- and high-poverty schools; (7) the alternate routes to teaching and the percentage of teachers licensed through such routes; (8) the criteria used by the state to evaluate or approve education schools, colleges, or programs; and (9) other test score data. An interim report, including preliminary data on numbers (1), (5), and (6) above, must be sent to the Department of Education within six months of the Higher Education Act's enactment. For this initial report, states are only required to submit the data that are readily available to them and to IHEs.

Within two years and six months of the enactment of the Higher Education Act, the Secretary of Education is to publish a report card on teacher qualifications in the United States. Data then will be collected annually so that the Secretary may make a yearly report to the Congress.

Other

Any LEA that benefits from activities funded through Title II must provide information regarding qualifications of a student's teacher to his or her parents upon request.

States must have in place within two years a process to identify and assist low-performing education schools, colleges, or programs. If a teacher education unit ultimately loses program approval or state funding for its teacher preparation program due to poor performance, it won't be eligible to receive federal professional development funds and students in its program won't be eligible for federal student aid.

Preparing for Title II Implementation

Title II Awards

The Secretary of Education will design and issue RFPs for the programs funded through Title II. Department officials speculate that they will issue RFPs in February or March of 1999 and make awards the following July or August. Information on the status of possible Title II awards will be placed on AACTE's web site (www.aacte.org) and published in the organization's newsletter, *Briefs*.

Constructing a Systemic Framework

Language in an earlier version of Title II in-

cluded a provision to encourage states and partnerships to submit joint applications. Although this proviso did not make it into the final law, it does reflect the intent of the Congress that partnerships and states should be encouraged to approach teacher education revisions in a coordinated manner. Institutions that plan to compete for partnership awards are advised to consider how their partnership will reflect and complement state efforts.

Title II clearly describes the required members of the partnerships: an institution that prepares teachers, an arts and sciences school, and a high-need LEA. For purposes of this Act, the Congress defines an arts and sciences school as "the unit within an IHE that offers one or more academic majors in disciplines or content areas corresponding to the subject matter areas in which teachers provide instruction." Thus, a partnership could include both education and arts and sciences units from the same institution. Multi-institution partnerships also would be allowed as long as both education and arts and sciences components are represented. The local education agency involved in the partnership must have a high percentage of families with incomes below the poverty line, a high percentage of secondary-level teachers providing instruction outside of their content area, and a high teacher turn-over rate.

States receiving awards through Title II have a range of purposes for which the funds can be used. It is expected that whichever of the allowable uses of funds they select, it will result in increased student performance, revisions in teacher licensure requirements to raise standards, and more teachers prepared to teach in core academic subjects. It would be prudent for teacher educators in states that apply for and receive Title II funds to be involved, as appropriate, in the state's standards revision activities.

Data Reporting

Even if there were no Title II partnership, state, or recruitment awards, the Higher Education Act would have included a requirement that data on teacher preparation requirements and procedures be submitted to the Secretary of Education. To some degree this reflects skepticism in the Congress about the quality of teacher education in the United States, but possibly to a greater extent it illustrates lawmakers' confusion about where the accountability for ensuring good teaching resides. Although states have the greater reporting burden, institutions that prepare teachers also must compile and submit data. An interesting wrinkle in the law requires IHEs to submit their required data to the state to be included in the state's report to the Secretary of Education.

The data reporting requirement may have positive and negative consequences. States must report the number of certification waivers they grant each year and disaggregate the information by low and high-income school districts. This may provide useful information to teacher educators and others regarding the actual supply and demand profile for teachers in the state. States also are charged with reporting pass rate data, by institution, on teaching candidates licensure examination scores. IHEs are expected to send the information to the appropriate state agency (not defined in law), however it is probable that states have these data through another source: students self-reported institutional affiliation when they fill out licensure examination forms. It is reasonable to expect that through student reporting error or other factors, data from testing companies on institutional pass rates and the institution's data may differ. Institutions are encouraged to work with the state agency that will collect these data to ensure that IHEs have an opportunity to verify it before it is forwarded to the Secretary of Education.

Title II contains two requirements that the Congress considers "consumer protection" provisions. Any LEA involved in a partnership

that receives Title II funds must make information regarding the subject matter qualifications of a student's teacher available to his or her parents upon request. The LEA must have provisions in place to notify parents that this information is available. Data that institutions compile on the percentage of their students that pass initial licensure examinations must be made public. This information is to be made widely available to potential students as well as to school districts that may hire teachers prepared by the institution.

As part of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 1999, the Congress allocated $1.2 billion for class size reduction. These funds are to be allocated directly to local education agencies (LEA) to be used primarily to recruit, hire, and prepare teachers through traditional or alternative routes. Up to 15 percent of an LEA's award may be used for teacher testing or for educator professional development. Institutions engaged in partnerships with schools in low-income districts that apply for grants under HEA, Title II may want to investigate ways in which the partnership may access and use class size reduction funds as well.

The text of HEA, Title II can be found on AACTE's State Policy web site at: www.edpolicy.org/nat.iss/secure/leg/b3.htm.

AACTE Combined Governmental Relations Committee

Nicholas Michelli, Chair
Dean, College of Education and Human Services,
Montclair State University
Upper Montclair, NJ 07043

G. Thomas Bellamy
Dean, School of Education, University of Colorado at Denver
Denver, CO 80217-3364

Louis A. Castenell
Dean, School of Education, University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0002

Viola Florez
Dean, College of Education, University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Karen Gallagher
Dean, School of Education, University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045

William Harvey
Dean, School of Education, University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee
Milwaukee, WI 53201

Edward Kujawa
Director, Elementary Teacher and Special Education
College of Education
University of San Diego

Carl Martray
Dean, College of Education and Psychology
University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, MS 39406

James W. Pellegrino
Frank W. Mayborn, Professor of Cognitive Studies
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37203

Katharine Rasch
Dean, College of Education
Maryville University
St. Louis, MO 63141

Governmental Relations & Issue Analysis Department

Penelope M. Earley
Senior Director
pearley@aacte.org

Michelle M. Buehlmann
Program Associate
mbuehlmann@aacte.org

Daniel A. Laitsch
Program Associate
dlaitsch@aacte.org

Karen T. McMullen
Administrative Assistant
kmcmullen@aacte.org

1307 New York Avenue, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20005
tel: 202/ 293-2450 fax: 202/ 457-8095
Web site: http://www.aacte.org